

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY
SENATE - March 10, 1967

The University Senate met at 2 p.m., March 10, 1967, President Elliott presiding. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

President Elliott introduced Mr. Robin Kay, new President of the Student Council, and the retiring President, Mr. Richard Harrison, rose to say a few words to the Senate in farewell. Mr. Harrison thanked the Senate for its new policy of inviting the President of the Student Council and the Editor of the University HATCHET to attend its meetings. He mentioned the continuing need for better communication among all members of the University family, the strong desire of the student body for the inclusion of a theater in the Student Center, and suggestions for curriculum changes (not yet fully formulated) which the students would like to see in Columbian College.

President Elliott welcomed Professors Brewer and Stevens who have both recovered well from their recent illnesses.

On motions made and seconded the following students were unanimously elected to membership on the Student Relationships Committee:

Jay Bomze - Columbian College
Jackie Banyasz School of Education
Stephen Remsberg Columbian College

On motion made and seconded, the following members of the Nominating Committee to elect the Executive Committee for the 1967 Session were unanimously elected:

Howard M. Merriman	Raymond Hanken
Edwin L. Stevens	Hugh LeBlanc
Robert E. Cronin	Glen Weston
Edwin J. B. Lewis	Charles S. Tidball

On motion made and seconded Professor Harry Page was unanimously elected to serve on the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty. Professor Page has expressed an interest in the study of possible calendar changes suggested by Dr. Reesing which has been placed with the Administrative Matters for detailed study.

Professor Glen Weston presented the Special Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom with accompanying Resolution (66/14) on THE SEAS EVALUATION REPORT OF THE HOLLOMON COMMITTEE and moved its adoption, seconded by Professor Stevens. Professor dePian, a member of this Committee, who concurred in the recommendation that no revision should be made in the provisions of the Code as mentioned in the Report, but who had reservations about some statements in the Report and Preamble of the Resolution, rose to clarify his reasons for these reservations. Professor dePian feels that administrators should not make the final choice in promotions in academic rank of faculty members, and does not agree with the emphasis placed on AAUP recommendations and the requirements of the Association of American Law Schools in the present report, to the exclusion of the recommendations which might be more germane from the Engineering Council for Professional Development which visited the Engineering School last May and is responsible for the accreditation of Engineering Schools.

After considerable discussion of the report and remarks to the question by Professors Heller, Willson and Wood, Resolution 66/14 was voted and unanimously carried. Professor Wood stated that other aspects of the report were being studied by the Educational Policy and University Objectives Committees of the Senate in the areas of their special competence.

On behalf of the Committee on Public Ceremonies, Dean Latimer, seconded by Professor Sharpe, presented the attached RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE ON HONORS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (#66/13). A Substitute Motion (See 66/13A) was presented by Professor Willson, seconded by Dean Latimer, who agreed to withdraw the original #66/13 and accept the substitute motion in its place. After general discussion, the Substitute Motion was unanimously carried.

Professor Perros, a member of the Consortium Liaison Group, addressed the Senate. He stated that a meeting of this Group had been held on February 15 in the office of the Director of the Consortium, Dr. Elmer West, and that representatives of four member universities were present. Professor Perros stated that the two major points discussed were 1) the concern of faculty members in certain departments that decisions affecting their departments would be made without appropriate consultation with them, and 2) the lack of communication generally between members of the faculty of the member universities and the Consortium contractors. Professor Perros stated that the Group publishes a Consortium newsletter and plans to meet once a month. Dr. Kraus, another member of the Group, agreed that lack of communication was the major problem and cited as an example the question of teaching priorities in certain areas which are not clearly defined. Inasmuch as the Consortium is an agreement between universities as corporate bodies, Dr. Kraus said, it pertains mostly to the administration and is therefore difficult to establish faculty participation at a level which would be meaningful. The Liaison Group will attempt to bridge this gap in communication.

Professor Wood announced progress in the recovery of Dean Metivier who has been ill and welcomed Professors Stevens and Brewer back to the Senate. He announced that elections were completed in the School of Medicine, Law School and School of Education and will be held shortly in the School of Engineering and in Columbian College. He also reminded the Committee chairmen that Annual Reports are due for the April meeting.

After a suspension of the rules of order to present a resolution not announced in the agenda, Professor Yakobson, on behalf of the Chairman of the Student Relationships Committee, presented the attached RESOLUTION FOR INCLUSION OF A THEATER IN THE UNIVERSITY CENTER (66/15), seconded by Professor Willson. After general discussion of this resolution, it was adopted unanimously.

President Elliott stated that it is his wish that the Center have a facility for the Performing Arts, "if it is at all possible to do without displacing the rest of the building." He planned to meet later today with the Committee on Performing Arts for further discussions.

Professors Stevens and Brewer rose to thank the Senate for the many expressions of good wishes they had received while away from the University.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

FREDERICK R. HOUSER
SECRETARY


THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington D. C.

Report of the Nominating Committee
to present a slate of nominees
for the Executive Committee for
the University Senate Session
1967-68

This Committee met at 12:30 p.m., Tuesday, April 11, 1967 and
unanimously nominated the following persons to serve on the Executive
Committee for the 1967-68 Session of the University Senate:

Richard C. Allen (Law)
Seymour Alpert (Medicine)
Galip M. Arkilic (Engineering)
Robert C. Willson (Columbian College)
Reuben E. Wood (Columbian College), Chairman

Robert E. Cronin
Hugh LeBlanc
Edwin J. B. Lewis
Raymond Hanken
Howard M. Merriman
Charles S. Tidball
Glen E. Weston



Edwin L. Stevens
Chairman

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE ON HONORS OF THE

UNIVERSITY SENATE (66/13)

Whereas the Committee on Public Ceremonies of the University Senate believes that the faculty of the University should have a role in the recommendation of candidates for honorary degrees,

Be it resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University, that a Committee on Honors of the University Senate be established.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington D. C.

To: Members of University
Senate

1 March 1967

The University Senate will meet at 2:10 p.m. on Friday, March 10, 1967 in the Faculty Conference Room, Fifth Floor, Library Building.

Agenda:

- ✓ 1) Presentation of a Resolution to Establish a Committee on Honors of the University Senate (see attached) - Committee on Public Ceremonies.
- ✓ 2) Introduction of the new President of the Student Council and Remarks from the Retiring President of the Student Council.
- ✓ 3) Election of students to the Student Relationships Committee.
- ✓ 4) Nomination of the following members to the Nominations Committee for the election of the Executive Committee for the 1967/68 Session:

Howard M. Merriman	Raymond Hanken
Edwin L. Stevens	Hugh LeBlanc
Robert E. Cronin	Glen Weston
Edwin J. B. Lewis	Charles S. Tidball
- ✓ 5) Nomination of Professor Harry Page to the Committee on Administrative Matters.
- ✓ 6) Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom with Resolution (see attached)
- ✓ 7) Report from the Faculty Liaison Group to the Consortium.

FREDERICK R. HOUSER
SECRETARY

SPECIAL REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON
PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM
on the SEAS Evaluation Report

The SEAS Evaluation Report and its Recommendation

At the request of the Chairman of the Executive Committee, the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has given consideration to the Report entitled "Technology and the Modern University" which was submitted in November 1966 by a special Advisory Committee on Engineering and Applied Science. This Committee, which was appointed by President Elliott to appraise the School of Engineering and Applied Science, had as its Chairman, Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. Other members of the Committee included some faculty members of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, faculty members of other schools in the University, representatives of the engineering community and of the federal government. (For convenience, the advisory committee report will be referred to hereinafter as the "SEAS Evaluation Report").

The SEAS Evaluation Report contains the following recommendation:

"24. The Department chairman and the Dean of the School should have the clear responsibility and authority for implementing the curriculum and the final recommendations for promotion and salaries of the faculty. It should be noted that this necessary administrative arrangement is in conflict with the current code and ordinances governing the academic personnel of The George Washington University. It will, therefore, be necessary to revise or at least make a different interpretation of this code."

The Faculty Code Provisions

Article X of the Code and Ordinances Governing the Academic Personnel of the University (Faculty Code) provides that the faculty and appropriate administrative officers exercise a responsibility "in recommendations as to selection and determination of status of members of the faculty" and specifies that this includes participation by the faculty "in formulating and transmitting recommendations for appointing, renewing appointments, promoting, designating tenure status, and terminating appointments for members of the active-status grade of academic service." The Faculty Code also sets forth "Principles, Standards and Procedures for faculty participation" in action concerning faculty membership. These specify that:

"The faculty of a department or of a nondepartmentalized school or college . . . shall establish procedures enabling an elected standing committee, or a committee of the whole, to submit its recommendations for appointments. Recommendations for actions other than appointments concerning full-time instructors, assistant professors, or associate professors shall be determined by the tenure members of the faculty of higher rank or of equal and higher rank, as the faculty may have determined by previously established procedures. Recommendations for actions other than appointments concerning professors shall be determined by tenure members of the rank of professor.

The Code further provides that:

"Appointments and actions affecting renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure designation and termination of service shall normally be effectuated in accordance with faculty recommendations. Departures from this standard shall be limited to those cases involving compelling reasons."

Procedure is also set forth in the Faculty Code for cases of nonconcurrence of administrative officers, with such matters being reported to the Executive Committee of the Senate for endeavors to harmonize the views of faculty and administrative officers or to evaluate and make recommendations concerning the compelling reasons for nonconcurrence.

Organization of S.E.A.S.

At the time of the Hollomon Committee appraisal, the School of Engineering and Applied Science had a unified faculty with no departmental organization. It was divided into "groups" which lacked full departmental status but which submitted recommendations on curricula and similar matters for approval or disapproval by the Dean's Council. The S.E.A.S. faculty had delegated powers to approve curricula, establish academic standards, admission standards and other academic policy matters to its Dean's Council. The Dean's Council included the S.E.A.S. faculty members elected to the University Senate, the Assistant Deans and the Dean served as Chairman.

In accordance with the Faculty Code, the S.E.A.S. faculty had established a Faculty Personnel Committee to make decisions on behalf of the faculty on faculty appointments, promotions and tenure designations. The Personnel Committee consisted of the S.E.A.S. faculty members elected to the Senate plus at least two other elected faculty members.

Subsequent to the SEAS Evaluation Committee visit, SEAS has been reorganized into full Departments, each of which has either its own faculty personnel committee or acts as a committee of the whole on personnel matters.

Supporting Findings of the SEAS Evaluation Report

The SEAS Evaluation Report included several findings and comments concerning the SEAS organization which formed the basis for its recommendation for a revision or reinterpretation of the Faculty Code. These include the following:

- (1) "A faculty member has no single supervisor, and thus has several 'bosses.' His teaching load is decided by the Assistant Dean (Academic) and Dean's Council; his salary by the Deans; and his promotion by the Faculty Personnel Committee. It is difficult to decide for the faculty, teaching loads, salary, and promotion when authority lies in three different places."
- (2) The groups and group leaders "have no decision-making authority. They can only recommend to the various administrative officers and bodies."

- (3) "Because of the decision-making power of the Dean's Council, and to a lesser extent, the Faculty Personnel Committee, many decisions of the School are made by committees. Only a majority is needed to decide on an action. Management by committee generally tends to weaken the effectiveness of an organization."
- (4) "In summary, organization of SEAS is such that most of the powers normally assigned to the Dean have been removed and have been placed into the Dean's Council which is comprised of faculty members elected by the faculty themselves. The Engineering School appears to be in a state of disorganization, which is particularly evident in the group structure of the faculty. These groups are each organized under a chairman who has no authority. Most faculty members belong to at least two groups and some more."
- (5) "At present, each group has a curricular responsibility but the promotions, course assignments, etc., are the responsibility of the Dean's Council leaving the chairmen of the groups powerless and inactive. We thus have in SEAS what appears to be a classic example of responsibility without authority and authority without responsibility."

Recommendation of the Senate Committee on
Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

The Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, after reviewing the recommendation of the SEAS Evaluation Report and its supporting statements and giving consideration to the problems mentioned, has concluded that it would be inadvisable to amend or reinterpret the Faculty Code. Among the many reasons that might be given in support of this conclusion, the following seem particularly cogent:

1. The Faculty Code provision is based upon the experience of The George Washington University and other major universities that the soundest means of making decisions upon matters of faculty appointment and status that are so vital to the future development of a university is through full discussion and concurrence of the faculty of the school or department involved or a representative group thereof. Faculty members who have established their competency in the academic disciplines involved are particularly qualified to ascertain and evaluate the teaching, research and general professional competency of those who are to become colleagues in teaching the same discipline. The opportunity for pooling the relevant information, evaluations of past work and potentials afforded by the Code procedures is more likely to assure that decisions are made with full consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the individuals involved.

2. The Faculty Code provision is in harmony with the recommendations of the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (published in 52 AAUP Bulletin 375 (Dec. 1965)) which states:

"The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty

"Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail."

3. The Faculty Code provision follows the requirements or recommendations of some accrediting groups and a change in the Code to lessen the degree of faculty participation in matters of faculty status could conceivably result in substantial criticism from such groups. For example, the Association of American Law Schools articles of Association (which was among the numerous examples studied by the committee of the Senate that drafted the present faculty code) contain the following provisions:

"ARTICLE 6. REQUIREMENTS

"Section 6-1. To the end that high standards of legal education be fostered, each members school should maintain: . . .

"4. A faculty of high competence and suitable size, vested with primary responsibility for determining institutional policies.

"APPROVED ASSOCIATION POLICY

". . . As to personnel matters, experience in the law school world has shown that a competent faculty is best assured by the faculty's exercising a substantial degree of control over decanal and faculty appointments or changes in faculty status (such as promotions, tenure designations, and renewal or termination of term appointments). The capacity to make the pertinent decisions is maintained by procedures under which

- "i. The faculty (acting as a whole or by a representative portion determined by reasonable criteria), assembled in a meeting of which suitable notice has been given, makes the initial choice with respect to faculty appointments or changes in faculty status, for submission through any intermediate approving authorities to the final appointing authority;
- "ii. The faculty, individually or collectively, is consulted with respect to the appointment of the dean before submission of any official recommendation to the final appointing authority;
- "iii. Except in rare cases and for compelling reasons, no decanal or faculty appointment or change in faculty status will be made over the expressed opposition of the faculty (acting as a whole or by a representative portion determined by reasonable criteria)."

4. The reasons given by the SEAS Evaluation Report do not provide sufficient justification for amending or reinterpreting the Faculty Code:

(a) Much of the specific criticism of the Report was directed to the lack of authority of the "groups" to make decisions on promotions, etc. Since SEAS is now departmentalized, this authority is fully vested in the faculty of the departments and this major basis for criticism no longer exists.

(b) The SEAS Evaluation Report's statement that decision-making is difficult when the faculty determines promotions while the Dean determines salaries is not borne out by the experience at The George Washington University and other major universities where this division of authority has long been traditional.

(c) The SEAS Evaluation Report appears to be based in part upon a misconception concerning the normal relationship between a dean and the faculty. The Report's reference to functions "normally assigned to the Dean" having been removed in SEAS apparently assumes erroneously that it is normal practice for universities to vest most powers of decision on curriculum, personnel, faculty status, etc. in the Dean. It thus overlooks the long tradition that educational policy and faculty status decisions are made by the faculty after full collegial discussion, and the Dean's role is principally one of leadership and effective implementation of the educational policy determinations thus made, rather than that of a "boss."

(d) The SEAS Evaluation Report makes no findings that unwise decisions on matters of faculty status have been made as a result of the Faculty Code and no reasons are given to support the apparent belief that sounder decisions would result from reposing authority to make such decisions in Deans or department chairmen.

-8-

5. In the judgment of the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom the procedures set forth in the Faculty Code should be fully sufficient to resolve any problems of disagreement of the nature that were of apparent concern to the SEAS Advisory Committee. The Code provision quoted above permits a deviation in exceptional cases involving "compelling reasons" which are to be reported and reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. In cases of termination or alleged violation of rights, privileges and responsibilities of faculty members, paragraphs 1 and 2 on pages 22-23 of the Code provide for informal consultation and conferences and reference to an ad-hoc committee which may even be composed of outsiders recognized as experts upon the problem involved.

6. The Senate Committee does not believe that it would be desirable to exempt any particular school or department from the Code provision.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom believes that no change should be made in the provisions of the Faculty Code. The Committee therefore recommends adoption by the Senate of the attached Resolution.

Richard C. Allen, Law
Paul A. Crafton, Engineering
Paula B. Kaiser, Anesthesiology
Wood Gray, History
James Mosel, Psychology
Glen E. Weston, Law, Chairman

Professor Louis dePian, Engineering, concurs in the recommendation that no revision should be made in the provisions of the Code, but has some reservations about some statements in the Senate Committee Report and Preamble of the Resolution.

Substitute

A RESOLUTION TO FACILITATE THE UNIVERSITY SENATE'S NOMINATION
OF CANDIDATES FOR HONORARY DEGREES 66/13

Whereas (a) the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University now provide a mechanism for the consideration of nominations by the University Senate of candidates for honorary degrees, and

Whereas (b) the Senate now has a Standing Committee on Public Ceremonies and Assemblies, and

Whereas (c) under the Faculty Organization Plan, section III (5)(c)(1), the Senate has power to determine the nature of its Standing Committees, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The functions of the Standing Committee on Public Ceremonies and Assemblies shall be enlarged to include submitting recommendations to the University Senate for nominations to the Board of Trustees of candidates for honorary degrees.

Executive Committee

March 10, 1967

Substitute for Committee on Public Ceremonies and Assemblies 66/13

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE SEAS EVALUATION
REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL
ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM
66/14

Whereas, the special Advisory Committee on Engineering and Applied Science appointed by President Elliott to appraise the School of Engineering and Applied Science has rendered a report recommending revision of the Code and Ordinances Governing Academic Personnel of the University to vest authority for final recommendations for promotions of faculty members in the Dean of the School or the Department Chairman, and

Whereas, the Code provisions are based upon the experience of The George Washington University and other major universities that vesting primary responsibility for appointments, promotions and tenure designations in the faculty is the best means of assuring that competent faculty will be appointed and retained, and

Whereas, the present Code provisions are in accord with the recommendations of the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and are also in accord with the recommendations of other university educational groups,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

That the University Senate recommends that no revision be made in the provisions of the Code and Ordinances Governing Academic Personnel of the University concerning responsibility and procedures for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure designations.

A RESOLUTION FOR INCLUSION OF A THEATER IN THE UNIVERSITY CENTER

66/15

Whereas (a) the philosophy of a university provides direction and unity to its diverse functions, and what is honored by a university will be cultivated there, and

Whereas (b) The George Washington University views the fine arts, not as a luxury or a cultural ornament of life, but as a central requisite of the educated man, insuring the continuity of human experience, and

Whereas (c) the University, in its concern for the ultimate quality of the student's inner life, recognizing how deeply the performing arts contribute to this inner life, is committed to a challenging program of the fine arts which encourages that experiencing of works of art which is both a perceiving and a sharing, and

Whereas (d) the University's philosophy acknowledges the need for adequate facilities for both performers and audiences to participate in this vital experience, and the present University facilities are sadly deficient, and

Whereas (e) the proposed University Center, which as charged in the original guiding memorandum would "primarily house voluntary extracurricular, social, intellectual, and physical activities," was envisioned as a symbol of the University and its deepest commitments, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The University Senate urges that the University provide a facility for the performing arts at The George Washington University, and that such a facility be provided, if possible, in the University Center.

Committee on Student Relationships
10 March 1967

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

February 24, 1967

To: Professor Sharpe, Parliamentarian, University Senate

From: Loretta M. Stallings, Chairman, Senate Committee on
Public Ceremonies

Re: Resolution for March 10, 1967

As I mentioned yesterday, Dr. Latimer, University Marshal and ex officio member of the Senate Committee on Public Ceremonies, has agreed to be present at the March 10th meeting of the Senate in order to give the background and rationale for the enclosed Resolution of the Committee.

Unfortunately I cannot be present at the meeting to present the Resolution and therefore accept your kind offer to this and for Dr. Latimer's remarks from the floor.

Loretta Stallings

cc: Dr. Latimer

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE ON HONORS
OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Whereas the Committee on Public Ceremonies of the University Senate believes that the faculty of the University should have a role in the recommendation of candidates for honorary degrees,

Be it resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University,

that a Committee on Honors of the University Senate be established.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington D. C.

17 February 1967

To: Members of the Faculty

From: Chairman of the Executive Committee
of the University Senate

A report entitled "A Critical Self-Evaluation of The George Washington University" has been submitted to the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools' Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Although it did not seem necessary to undertake the expense of preparing copies of this report for every faculty member, the reports may be read by interested members of the Faculty. A number of copies are available for loan to faculty members. They can be obtained at the office of the Dean of the Summer Sessions, Bacon Hall, Room 308.